

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kawamura Hisayuki (JP 2000-315581). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite "wherein the layer containing the light emitting material is interposed between a layer containing molybdenum oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property, and a layer containing an oxide semiconductor or metal oxide and a material having a higher electron transporting property than a hole transporting property." Independent Claims 3, 5, and 8 have been amended in a similar manner. The features of this amendment are supported by, for example, paragraph [0021] of the specification and Fig. 1A of the present application. For example, Fig. 1A shows the layer containing the light emitting material (see e.g. 104 of Fig. 1A) is interposed between a layer containing molybdenum oxide (e.g. para. [0021]) and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property (e.g. 103 of Fig. 1A) and a layer containing an oxide semiconductor or metal oxide and a material having a higher electron transporting property than a hole transporting property (e.g. 105 of Fig. 1A).

In contrast, the Examiner contends that Kawamura teaches in figure 1 and paragraphs 37-43 the layer (16) containing the light emitting material is interposed between a layer (20) containing an

oxide semiconductor or metal oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property, and a layer (12) containing an oxide semiconductor or metal oxide and a material having a higher electron transporting property than a hole transporting property. However, Kawamura appears to disclose that layer 20 contains an organic compound and a reducing dopant (see e.g. paragraphs 37-43, in particular paragraphs 40-43 of English translation of Kawamura, in the IDS filed herewith), and that layer 12 contains an organic compound and an oxidizing dopant (see paragraphs 40-43 of Kawamura).

In contrast, as explained above, in independent Claims 1, 3, 5 and 8, the layer containing the light emitting material is interposed between a layer containing molybdenum oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property, and a layer containing an oxide semiconductor or metal oxide and a material having a higher electron transporting property than a hole transporting property. At the very least, Kawamura does not appear to disclose or suggest molybdenum oxide, i.e. a layer containing molybdenum oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are not disclosed or suggested by Kawamura, and Claims 1, 3, 5, 8 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Kawamura. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

##### Claims 11, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24

The Examiner also rejects Claims 11, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura Hisayuki in view of Leo et al. (U.S. 2005/0236973). This

rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 11 and 14 to recite “wherein the first layer contains molybdenum oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property.”

For similar reasons as explained above, Kawamura does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature of Claims 11 and 14. Leo also does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Therefore, independent Claims 11 and 14 are not disclosed or suggested by cited references, and Claims 11, 14 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claims 21, 22 and 24, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 6 and 9, 12, 15 and 23

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6 and 9, 12, 15 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura Hisayuki in view of Kido (JP 10-270171). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references.

Applicants note that in the rejection, the Examiner contends that Kido teaches the use of molybdenum oxide.<sup>1</sup> Applicants have reviewed Kido and could not find a teaching of use of

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that there is not specific cite as to where this feature is allegedly

molybdenum oxide. Therefore, this claimed feature (now in the independent claims) is also not disclosed or suggested by Kido.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 23, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 12, 15 and 23

The Examiner also rejects Claims 12, 15 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura Hisayuki in view of Leo et al. and Kido. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references.

Further, as explained above, Applicants could find no teaching of the use of molybdenum oxide in Kido.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 23 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 17-20 and 25-30

The Examiner also rejects Claims 17-20 and 25-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura Hisayuki in view of Leo et al. and Kido. This rejection is also

---

disclosed in Kido.

respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 17, 25 and 29 to recite “wherein the first layer contains molybdenum oxide and a material having a higher hole transporting property than an electron transporting property.”

For similar reasons as explained above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest this claimed feature of Claims 17, 25 and 29.

Therefore, independent Claims 17, 25 and 29 are not disclosed or suggested by cited references, and Claims 17, 25 and 29 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. The IDS includes full English translations of JP09-063771 and JP2000-315581 which were previously submitted and considered by the Examiner with an English abstract.

It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: February 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.

200 West Adams Street

Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568